

### REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action mailed February 28, 2008. In the office action the Examiner:

- rejected claims 1-4, 6-30, 32-46 and 48-58 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph;
- rejected claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-20, 22-24, 27-30, 32-33, 35-46, 48-49 and 51-58 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese et al. (US 6,006,218) (hereinafter “Breese”) in view of Konig et al. (US 6,981,040) (hereinafter “Konig”);
- rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese et al. (US 6,006,218) in view of Konig, further in view of Gerace (US 5,848,396) (hereinafter “Gerace”);
- rejected claims 8, 34, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese in view of Konig, further in view of Gabriel et al. (US 6,584,468) (hereinafter “Gabriel”); and
- rejected claims 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese in view of Konig, further in view of Dumais et al. (US 2004/0267700) (hereinafter “Dumais”).

In this Response, no claims have been amended, added or cancelled. The pending claims are: claims 1-4, 6-30, 32-46 and 48-58.

#### *Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph*

Support for the claim limitation “updating the first user profile based on a document selected by the first user from the set of search result documents, including analyzing links within the document and adding information derived from the analyzed links to the first user profile,” as recited in claim 1 can be found at least in claims 1, 4 and 5, as originally filed:

Claim 1, as originally filed, which reads as follows:

A method of personalizing search results of a search engine, comprising:

accessing a user profile for a user based on information about the user, the user information including information derived from a set of documents, *the set of documents comprising a plurality of documents selected from the set consisting of documents identified by search results from the search engine, documents accessed by the user, documents linked to the documents identified by search results from the search engine, and documents linked to the documents accessed by the user...* (Emphasis Added).

Claim 4, as originally filed, which reads as follows:

The method of claim 1, including updating the user profile by:  
updating a term-based profile by identifying a set of terms from  
*a document in the set of documents*, and adding information  
about the identified set of terms to the term-based profile....  
(Emphasis Added).

Claim 5, as originally filed, which reads as follows:

The method of claim 4, including updating the user profile by:  
*updating a link-based profile by analyzing links in the*  
*document*, and adding information derived from the analyzed  
links to the link-based profile. (Emphasis Added).

Further, paragraph 0032 of the specification states:

*After receiving search results, the user may click on some of the*  
*URL links*, thereby downloading the documents referenced by  
those links, so as to learn more details about those documents.  
Certain types of general information 207 can be associated with  
a set of user selected or use identified documents. *For*  
*purposes of forming a user profile, the identified documents*  
*from which information is derived for inclusion in the user*  
*profile may include:* documents identified by search results  
from the search engine, documents accessed (e.g., viewed or  
downloaded, for example using a browser application) by the  
user (including documents not identified in prior search  
results), documents linked to the documents identified by  
search results from the search engine, and *documents linked to*  
*the documents accessed by the user*, or any subset of such  
documents. (Emphasis added)

Based at least on this description in the specification and the originally filed claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the afore-mentioned claim limitation of claim 1 is supported by the specification. Remaining independent claims 18, 27 and 43 recite similar limitations as those discussed with reference to claim 1. Therefore, respective claim limitations of claims 18, 27 and 43 are also supported by the specification. In light of this discussion, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 18, 27 and 43, and associated dependent claims on these grounds.

#### *Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103*

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 18, 27 and 43. For instance, claim 1 recites:

updating the first user profile based on a document selected by the first user from the set of search result documents, including analyzing links within the document and adding information derived from the analyzed links to the first user profile....  
(emphasis added)

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Breese does not teach or suggest these limitations. (See Office Action dated 02/28/08, p. 5). The Examiner relies on Konig to teach or suggest these limitations.

However, Konig does not supply the missing limitations. Konig discloses updating a user model, using the following process:

[During] updating [of the User Model], both documents that are of interest to the user and documents that are not of interest to the user are analyzed and incorporated into the User Model. The process is as follows.... In step 84, documents 80 are parsed and separated into text, images and other non-text media 88, and formatting.... Through information extraction, links 90 to other documents ... are obtained.... Parsed portions of the documents and extracted information are processed to initialize or update the user representations in the User Model.... In step 100, the topic classifiers are applied to all extracted information and portions of documents 80 to obtain a probability distribution  $P(t|d)$  for each document on each node of the topic tree. (Konig, col. 17, line 50 to col. 18, line 20); Emphasis Added.

Thus, Konig only discloses parsing a document for hyperlinks, and estimating for each of the hyperlinks a probability that the hyperlink is of interest to a user. Konig further discloses what is done with the estimated probabilities:

A variety of personalized information services are provided using the estimated probabilities. In one application, network documents are crawled and parsed for links, and probable interest of the user in the links is calculated using the learning machine. Links likely to be of interest to the user are followed. (Konig, col. 5, lines 48-53); see also Figure 20.

Thus, Konig only discloses parsing crawled documents for links, calculating probable user interest in the parsed links using the learning machine, and preferentially following links likely to be of interest to the user. Konig is silent regarding and does not teach or suggest *analyzing links within the document and adding information derived from the analyzed links to the first user profile*, as claimed.

Further, none of Gerace, Gabriel and Dumais supplies the missing limitations. None of Gerace, Gabriel and Dumais teaches or suggests “updating the first user profile based on a

document selected by the first user from the set of search result documents, including analyzing links within the document and adding information derived from the analyzed links to the first user profile,” as claimed.

As none of the cited references teach each and every limitation of claim 1, claim 1 (and associated dependent claims) are patentable over the cited references. Independent claims 18, 27 and 43 recite similar limitations as those discussed with reference to claim 1. Therefore, claims 18, 27 and 43 and associated dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references.

With respect to claim 18 and its dependent claims, (as explained in more detail below) Breeze and Konig do not teach (A) “generating a personalized query strategy from the search query and the user profile;” and then (B) “selecting a personalized set of documents from the Internet according to the personalized query strategy.” In both Breeze and Konig, personalized information is used only to “post process” results produced by a search engine in response to a search query. See, for example, Fig. 19 of Konig and Fig. 2C (operations 230, 231 and 234, in that order) of Breeze. In Breeze, the very name of the “retrieval result adjusting module” 134, as well as the explanatory text at col. 6, ln 60-66, and col. 12, lines 32-48, teaches that the retrieval result adjusting module 134 of Breeze ranks or re-ranks search results. But there is no discussion in Breeze whatsoever about changing the search query or search query strategy used to produce a list of search results.

It is noted that in claim 18, the personalized search query is generated prior to “selecting a personalized set of documents” because the “selecting” is performed “according to the personalized search strategy.” Also, claim 18 requires the “personalized search strategy” is generated not just from the user profile, but also “from the search query.” These aspects of claim 18, and its dependent claims, are not taught by Breeze and Konig. For at least these additional reasons, claims 18 and its dependent claims are patentable over the combined teaches of the cited references.

In light of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-4000, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 28, 2008

/ Gary S. Williams /

31,066

Gary S. Williams

(Reg. No.)

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

2 Palo Alto Square

3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700

Palo Alto, CA 94306

(650) 843-4000